(33)

G. R. S. IX-5]

Previous references.

File No. 166-7

1929-30

Serial Nos. 1-9

(Law)

Later references.

Pol 5-30-66-11.

Law. 85. 30-8-9.

Passed
31/11/43

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

Serial Nos. Nil

Part B for Pol 530

SUBJECT.

Re. Instructions issued to Govt. Officers in connection with the Celebrations of the Silver Jubilee of His Majesty King George V.

Mr. S. Mahadeva
31/10/30

615 29/29

TELEGRAPHIC ADDRESS:—"INDUSCOM."

In reply please refer to No. E2-528/27-28

GOVERNMENT OF MYSORE.

DEPARTMENT OF INDUSTRIES AND COMMERCE.

Encl. Draft (9 pages) Date 166-29-1

OFFICE OF THE DIRECTOR,

Dated, Bangalore,.....18th June.....*19* 30.
Camp Mysore

FROM

C. RANGANATHA RAO SAHIB, Esq., B.A., B.L.,
Director of Industries and Commerce in Mysore,
(Bangalore, India.)

To

P. Mahadevayya, Esq., B.A., B.L.,
Legal Remembrancer and Secretary to Government,
Law Departments, Bangalore.
Camp - Mysore.

SIR,

(1) I have the honor to forward herewith the plaint along with documents consisting of 9 pages received from the Public Prosecutor of Bangalore for filing a suit against Mr. C. V. Balappa and his sureties for the recovery of the loan scholarship amount -ing to Rs13,723-4-2 as per Government order No. D. 12729-30/I & C 392-29-8 dated 16th May 1930. As the suit has to be filed before the 30th June 1930, I request that the plaint may be examined and your approval, if it is in order, communicated to me at a very -- early date.

The enclosures may kindly be returned with your letter.

I have the honor to be,
Sir,
Your most obedient servant,

C Ranganatha Rao Sahib
Director.

USC)

(2) Draft reply returning the enclosures + drawing attention to the non receipt of the plaint, put up -

24.6.30

General and Revenue Secretariat | Law File No. 166 of 1929. | App. F. [illegible]

Serial No.

To, The Dir of Ptc
P 7381 / dated 24.6.30.
returning the enclosures for retransmission with the draft plaint.

D.O. Letter dated 23/6 June from Dir of Ptc stating that since the last date for filing the suit is said to be 30th June 1930. the plaint maybe returned in a day or two

D.O. letter dated 24th June from Asst to the Dir' to the Asst Secy, forwarding the draft plaint & the documents.

(3) This being a suit by Govt, the period of limitation is 60 years under Art 149 & it is not clear how the Pltr says that the 30th June 1930 would be the last day for filing it.

(4) The file of papers containing the correspondence referred to in paras 1 to 8 are not sent & no opinion can therefore be expressed as to the said paras.

(5) In para 3, of the plaint it is said that the 2nd & 3rd defts have become liable to D as sureties for the whole debt due by the 1st, on account of the bond dt 27 executed by them. But [illegible]

Note—Contn. Sheet

WD 02328—GPB—10,000—22-4-30.

6159 6263 6268

Serial No.

the said bond shows that the 2nd & 3rd defts have not stood as sureties for the whole amount but only for Rs 2 ~~and that they are not in their personal capacity~~ since under the bond, moreover, they have not made themselves personally liable but have offered their joint family house as security. In such circs a decree as prayed for in the draft plaint cannot be granted.

(6) In para 4 the total amount due is stated. It would perhaps be necessary that a detailed statement showing how this amount is arrived at be filed with the plaint.

(7) The plaintiff is stated to be the Chief Secy to Govt. Under order 27 C.P.C it is sufficient if it is stated as "The Govt of Mysore". & under rule 1 the plaint may be signed by the Dir of I & C.

(8) Draft replies on the above lines for both.

25/6

(9) As regards

25/6

25/6

Since the document is not registered, no charge is created against the property

Note—Contn. Sheet

55 / 6268 4

General and Revenue Secretariat | Land File No. 166 of 1929 | App. F. III—2]

Serial No. 4

The Dir of Ir C.
P7457 (9) dated 26.6.30.
returning the plaint with remarks

Sus B to await reply
28/6

Letter no E2-528/27-28 dated 27th Aug 1930 from the Director of I&C forwarding a fresh plaint re: the institution of suit against Mr. C.V. Ballappa

10) The documents returned to the D. of I&C with S/ no: 4 have not been now sent with the revised plaint.

11) In view of the difficulties mentioned in para 5 supra, it is not clear how a decree personally against the debtor 243 is claimed in the draft Plaint.

12) Draft calling for information put up

Legal Dr

31-7

13)

1/8

To

The Director of Ind. & Commerce

Letter no: P. 654 dated 2nd Aug 1930, requesting forwarding the documents re: Suit against C.V. Ballappa & others.

13) To Dev Branch for kindly putting up the I&C file referred to in para 1 supra (Director's letter of 18th June 1930)

Dev Branch

6/8

Sir T.S.D
The linked file may be kept with you & sent after receipt of the Director's reply
6/8

Note—Cover Sheet.

WDW2328—GPB—10,000—22-4-30

(5)

General and Revenue Secretariat | File No. 166 | App. F. III—2] of 1929.

Serial No.	
7	Letter no. 82 - 528/27-28 dated 19th Aug 1930 Stating that he has requested the PPr. Bllore to forward the documents to-gether with his explanation for preferring a decree against defts 2 & 3 etc: Suit against Mr. C. V. Balappa & others.
8	2. Letter no. 72/30-31 dated 20.8.1930 from the PPr. Bllore forwarding the documents Connected with the Suit against Mr. C. V. Balappa.
	(1) Please put up a draft to PPr, Bllore acknowledging receipt of the documents sent & stating that the reasons for praying for a decree against defendants 2 & 3 in view of the difficulties pointed out in this office letter no: P. 7457 of 26.6.30, have not been furnished as yet — Copy may be sent to the Director of Ire. with reference to 6 & 7 above.
	PPP 22/8
	To
	Dep. Bry. with Compliments for favour of putting up the ore file referred to in para 1 Supra (Directors letter of 18th June 1930)
	To. PPP.

The file is marked to Dev Branch at 6/8. but has not been sent thereto - PPP 22/8.

WD 01684—GPB—80,000—20-4-29

9798 6

1705

General and Revenue Secretariat | File No. 16 of 1929. | App. F. III—2]

Serial No.

15) Subt with a dft to the PPr. Bangalore.
This file may be sent to the Dev. Br. for favour of putting up the Connected papers, after the issue of the present dft.
In orders.

TSD 25/8

Issue MP 28/8

To.

The PPr. Bangalore

No. P. 1114 dated 25.8.30 regarding ~~stating that~~ to explain the grounds on which a decree is prayed for against dfts 2 & 3 in a proposed suit against Mr. Gr. Balappa & others.

To

The Dev. Br. with Compliments for favour of putting up the Connected file

TSD 26/8

Issued.

Dc 394-28(7-8) is put up.

29/8.

Prdtn for with Compts

29/8

Letter No. 81/30-31 dated 25-8-30 from the PPr. Bglr stating that the 2nd & 3rd dfts were sought to be implicated on the strength of the bond which they have executed. ~~Though~~ the bond is unregistered it does not create a charge on any property.

1705

Mr. Gopalakrishna Kalyanasundaram

Dc Memorandum

26/8

NOTE—Contn. Sheet.

WD 02553-GPB—50,000—8 7 30

GOVERNMENT OF HIS HIGHNESS THE MAHARAJA OF MYSORE

General and Revenue Secretariat

Dated, Bangalore, 16/10/30

No. D 3939 / DE/134-30-1

1966 P

From

B. NARAINSWAMIENGAR, Esq., B. A., B. L.,
Secretary to the Government of His Highness the Maharaja of Mysore.
Development Departments.

To

The Director of Industries & Commerce
in Mysore, Bangalore.

Sir,

With reference to your Un-official Note No.55/528 of 27-28 dated 23rd September 1930 in the matter of filing a suit against Mr.C.V.Balappa and his sureties for the recovery of the loan scholarship amount due from the former, I am directed to state that Government consider that there is no hurry to file the suit immediately as the period of limitation is 60 years and to request that the Public Prosecutor may kindly be addressed to return the advance of Rs.1,160/- made to him. I am further to request that the submission of the report promised by you in regard to any amounts that may be found to be recoverable from Mr. Balappa by moral persuasion may be expedited.

I have the honour to be,
Sir,
Your most obedient servant,

B. Narainswamiengar

For Secretary to Government,
Development Departments.

NRV

Copy to Protection Branch for information. with their file.

R.N.14/10.

For perusal

T&D
17/10.

General and Revenue Secretariat

File No. 1916 / 1024

App. F. III—2] of 192

9

Mr TSD 8

Prop^{n} Br
The file sent is incomplete. I remember there were more notes regarding the advisability of instituting the suit. Please enquire what has become of those notes from the Dev^{t} Br that we should know. DMP 19.10.

The entire file of the Dev. Br. re: C. V. Balappa's case is locked up. The only note re: the advisability of instituting the suit is at flag 'B'. Dev. Br. has purposely kept it since it contains some other note of the Br. which is necessary for further action. The linked file will be returned after perusal. TSD 29/10.

Yes. This may be recorded now for the present, ~~after perusal~~. DMP 29.10.30.

B

TSD 31/10. DMP

Note—Contn. Sheet

WD*01684—GPB—80,000—20-4-29

Tels.—"INDUSCOM"

6263 9/29

GOVERNMENT OF MYSORE.

Codes used—A.B.C., 5th Edn., Bentleys.

D. O. No. E2 / 29. 30

Department of Industries and Commerce.

Mr. C. RANGANATHA RAO SAHIB, B.A., B.L.,
Director.

OFFICE OF THE DIRECTOR,

Bangalore, dated the.....23rd June.....*193* 0.

My dear Sir

The Public Prosecutor informs me that the suit to be filed against Mr. C. V. Balappa and his sureties will be barred by -- limitation if it is not filed before the 30th June 1930. I have already sent the plaint prepared by him for your scrutiny and - approval and would be obliged if you will kindly have the same returned to me in the course of a day or two to enable me to take further action in the matter.

Yours sincerely

C Ranganatha Rao Sahib

P. Mahadevayya, Esq., B.A., B.L.,
Legal Remembrancer and Secretary to Government,
Law Departments, Bangalore.

RAS-USC)

2

Appendix F G—1

SUBJECT.....

.....

.....

Diary No. of letter replied to.....

Section

File No.

Serial No. 2

No. 7081 Encl

General and Revenue Secretariat

( )

the 192

To

The Director of Commerce

Date of issue 24/6/30

Signed by M. N.S

Sir,

I have the honour to state that the plaint in the proposed suit against Mr C. V. Balakka & others said to have been sent with your letter no 526 dated 18th June 1930 & with documents, has not been received in this office. The enclosures to the letter are documents consisting of eight pages only & not 9 as stated in the letter — Enclosures They

List of enclosures.....

Copied by.....

Examined by.....

over

are herewith returned for
retransmission with the plaint
for scrutiny and approval

Shaweh

D M L.R

BNP
2/1/6

3

97081 Eng 9 24 6
30

The Director of Industries and Commerce in Mysore,

Mangalore.

I have the honour to state that the plaint in the proposed suit against Mr.C.B.Balappa and others, said to have been sent with your letter No.E.2-528/27-28 dated 18th June 1930 along with documents, has not been received in this office. The enclosures to the letter are documents consisting of eight pages only and not 9 as stated in the letter. They are herewith returned for retransmission with the plaint for scrutiny and approval.

I have the honour to be,

Sir,

Your most obedient servant,

For Legal Remembrancer &
Secretary to Government,
Law Department.

6268-97
p

Tele.—"INDUSCOM"

Codes used—A.B.C., 5th Edn., Bentleys.

4

GOVERNMENT OF MYSORE.

D. O. No. E2.528/27-28 Department of Industries and Commerce.

IMMEDIATE.

Enc. 1 plaint 8 documents

Mr. C. RANGANATHA RAO SAHIB, B.A., B.L.,
Director.

OFFICE OF THE DIRECTOR,

Bangalore, dated the 24th June *1930.*

Dear Mr. Sitharamiah,

With reference to the letter No.P.7381/Law dated 24-6-1930 in regard to the suit against Mr. C.V. Balappa and others, I very much regret that the plaint said to have been sent with this office letter of the 18th June was by oversight kept in the office. It is herewith enclosed. As regards the documents consisting of 8 pages, the two folds of one stamped document were counted as two in this office while perhaps it is counted as one in your office. Otherwise the documents are all right. The 8 documents along with the plaint are herewith retransmitted for favour of immediate scrutiny and approval.

Yours sincerely,

R. Ranganatha Rao Sahib

M.N. Sitharamiah, Esq., B.A., B.L.,
Assistant Secretary, Law Department,
General & Revenue Secretariat,
Bangalore.

Appendix F G—1

SUBJECT.....

.....

.....

Diary No. of letter replied to.....

Section Law

File No. 166.29

Serial No. 4

No. 7457 (9)

General and Revenue Secretariat

( )

the 193

To

The Director of Industries & Commerce.

Date of issue 26/6/30

Signed by.....

Sir,

In returning herewith the Draft plaint and the 8 documents sent with your letter No: E2-528-27-28 ~~dated~~ of yesterday's date in re the Suit against Mr C. V. Balappa & others, I have the honour to state that the Suit being one by Government, the period of limitation is 60 years under art 149 of the Limitation Regulation

over

List of enclosures.....

Copied by..... 26/6

Examined by.....

WD 02827—GPB—5,000—15-4-30

and as such, it cannot be barred if filed after the 30th June 1930.

The file of papers containing the correspondance referred to in paras 5 to 8 of the draft plaint are not sent and no opinion can therefore be expressed thereon -

In para 3 of the draft, it is said that the 2nd and 3rd defendants have become liable as sureties for the whole debt due by the 1st ~~defendant~~ But a perusal of the security bond ~~produced as registered~~ dated 2.7.1919 executed by them shows that the 2nd & 3rd defendants have not made themselves personally liable for any amount but have only offered their joint family house as security and that too, only to the extent of Rs 2000/- (The plaint & especially

the bond is however not registered & creates no charge on the property.

G. R. S. App F. G. 3.

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

(*Continuation sheet draft form.*)

the relief portion has therefore to be suitably modified.

Para 4 of the draft plaint states the amount due by the 1st defendant. A detailed statement as to how & when these payments were made has to be filed with the plaint.

The plaintiff is stated to be "The chief secy to Govt." Under order 27 C.P.C, it is sufficient if it is stated as "The Govt of Mysore" and ~~Rule~~ under rule 1 of the said order, the Director of I & C may sign & verify the plaint.

I have etc

Regd Dr.

PB—10,000—28-5-27

26th June 1930.

The Director of Industries and Commerce
in Mysore, Bangalore.

In returning herewith the draft plaint and the 8 documents sent with your letter No. E2-528-27-28 of yesterday's date, in re. the suit against Mr. C.V. Balappa and others, I have the honor to state that the suit being one by Government, the period of -- limitation is 60 years under Article 149 of the Limitation Regulatio and as such, it cannot be barred if filed after the 30th June 1930.

The file of papers containing the correspondence referred to in paras 5 to 8 of the draft plaint are not sent and no opinion can therefore be expressed thereon.

In para 3 of the draft, it is said that the 2nd and 3rd -- defendants have become liable as sureties for the whole debt due by the 1st. But a perusal of the security bond dated 2nd July 1919 executed by them shows that the 2nd and 3rd defendants have not made themselves personally liable for any amount but have offered their joint family house as security and that too, only to the extent of Rs. 2,000/- The bond is however not registered and creates no charge on the property. The plaint and especially the relief portion has therefore to be suitably modified.

Para 4 of the draft plaint states the amount due by the 1st - defendent. A detailed statement as to how and when these payments were made has to be filed with the plaint.

The plaintiff is stated to be "The Chief Secretary to Government". Under order 27 C.P.C. it is sufficient if it is stated as

"The Government of Mysore" and under rule 1 of the said order, the Director of Industries and Commerce may sign and verify the plaint.

I have the honor to be,

Sir,

Your most obedient servant,

Fair copy

Legal Remembrancer and Secretary
to Government Law Deptt.

C.M.

TELEGRAPHIC ADDRESS:—"INDUSCOM."

In reply please refer to No. E2-528/27-28

GOVERNMENT OF MYSORE.

DEPARTMENT OF INDUSTRIES AND COMMERCE.

OFFICE OF THE DIRECTOR,

Dated, Bangalore, 28th July 1930.

FROM

C. RANGANATHA RAO SAHIB, Esq., B.A., B.L.,
Director of Industries and Commerce in Mysore,
(Bangalore, India.)

To

P. Mahadevaiya, Esq., B.A., B.L.,
Legal Remembrancer and Law Secretary
to the Government of Mysore,
Bangalore.

SIR,

Subject:- Suit to be filed against Mr. C.V. Ballappa and others.

With reference to the correspondence ending with your letter No.7457(a) Law 166-29 dated 26th June 1930 on the above subject, I have the honour to forward herewith a fresh plaint received from the Public Prosecutor of Bangalore for filing a suit against the above defendants for the recovery of the loan scholarship amounting to Rs.13,723-4-2.

The Public Prosecutor has been requested to forward the file of papers containing the correspondence direct to you for reference.

I request you to kindly examine the plaint and favour me with a copy of the plaint as finally approved by you.

The enclosures may kindly be returned with your letter.

I have the honour to be,
Sir,
Your most obedient servant,

C Ranganatha Rao Sahib

DIRECTOR.

KS)

In the court of the District Judge
Bangalore

Original Suit No [redacted]/31.

Plaintiff

Government of Mysore,
by the Director of
Industries and Commerce
in Mysore, Bangalore

Defendants

1. C. V. Ballappa
2. C. Venkataswamy
3. C. V. Thimmappa.
Sons of Chikkavenkataswamy
25, Sreenivasa
Mandiram Road,
Bangalore city.

Under order VII Rule 1 of the C. P. Code the abovenamed plaintiff begs to state as follows:-

1. The addresses of the parties for service of notices and etc; are as stated above.

2. The 1st defendant applied for a foreign loan scholarship for purposes of study in England and the Government of Mysore was pleased to order the grant in accordance with the rules governing the subject.

3. The 1st defendant accordingly

executed the accompanying agreement dated 19th May 1919 by which he became bound to pay up the amounts spent on him. The 2nd and 3rd defendants who are the brothers of the 1st defendant and members of the joint Hindu family became sureties for the performance of the obligations of the 1st defendant and executed the bond on 2-7-1919 along with the 1st defendant. The period of scholarship was further extended at the desire and request of the 1st defendant.

4. A Sum of Rs 13.723-4-2 was spent on the 1st defendant for his studies. A memo of account is produced herewith. He returned to Bangalore after finishing his course in January 1923.

5. When the 1st defendant was called upon to pay up the amount due from him, he offered in his letter of 20.8.1924 to pay up the amount in instalments.

6. The Government accepted the 1st defendant's offer on condition that

on condition that he should pay Rs 50 monthly for 3 months and thereafter at Rs 100 per month, Commencing from September 1924 and that on failure to pay the instalments for 3 successive months the whole amount would become due.

7 The 1st defendant paid Rs 350/- only till June 1925 and failed to pay further instalments after that

8. The 1st defendant wrote on 30-6-1926 a letter promising to make regular payments from one year after the date of his letter. Even this promise he has failed to keep up

9. The defendants were often demanded to pay up the amount. and registered notices were also sent and they have not elicited any response. Hence this suit for recovery of the whole amount due.

10 The cause of action arose on or about 30-7-1924 in Bangalore

within the jurisdiction of this Honourable Court.

11. The value of the suit for purposes of Court fee and jurisdiction is as follows:-

Sum spent on 12th defendant less the sum received	13,373-4-2

Court fee is paid accordingly.

12. plaintiff prays for judgment.

(1) Decreeing the sum of Rs 13,373-4-2 against the 12th defendant.

(2) Decreeing the sum of Rs 2000 against defendants 2 & 3 as stipulated in the bond executed by them.

(3) Costs and future interest.

(4) Any other relief to which plaintiff may be found entitled to in the nature of the case.

I, the plaintiff do declare which

What is stated above is true to the best
of my knowledge, belief and information.

Bangalore

12

In the Court of

OO No. OF 1930 —1931.

~~Appellant~~ Plaintiff.		~~Respondent~~ Defendant.
The Government of Mysore by the Director of Industries & Commerce	Vs.	1. C. V. Ballappa 2. C. Venkataswamy 3. C. V. Thimappa

1. The plaintiff above named do, by these presents, retain Mr. B. N. Vijayadeva, M. A., Bar-at-law to appear and conduct the above case on my behalf to judgment.

2. I further empower him to do all necessary acts in the above case, to execute any decree or order that may be passed in my behalf, and to receive from the Court all documents, refunds and all sums of money that I may de entitled to get and grant receipts therefor.

3. I also undertake to confirm and ratify all the acts done by the said Advocate or by any other Advocate on his behalf in so doing.

.....193

Personally known to me and signed in my presence.—ACCEPTED.

Advocate

Advocate for.....

Sold by VIDYA VILASA, Book Depot, Chickpet, Bangalore City

The Indian Press, Balepet, B'lore City.

Detailed account of the Loan Scholarship of

Mr C. V. Balla

(13

Date of Payment	Detail	£	s.	d	Rs	As	p	Rs	As. p	Year
22/5/1919	passage money. ~~out fit~~ expenses.	40	-	-	574	-	-	949	- -	18-19
	out fit expenses	25	-	-	375	-	-			
December 1919	II quarter Scholarship	58	10	-						
March 1920	III —do—	58	10	-	1755	-	-	1755	-	19-20
1.6.20	IV —do—	58	10	-						
1.9.20	V —do—	58	10	0						
2.12.20	VI —do—	58	10	0						
1-3-21	—do—	61	10	0	4453	14	-	4448	-	21
2.6.21	VII —do—	62	10	0						
2.4.21	premium for practical training	100	0	0						
9.9.21	9th quarter Scholarship	62	10	0	874	5				
5.12.21	10th	62	10	0	917	12	6	3991	14	
4.3.22	11th	62	10	0	967	11				
10-6-22	12th	20	16	8	[illegible]					
7.7.22	—do—	41	13	4	[illegible]					
31.7.22	Additional Loan	10	0	0	[illegible]					
19.	13th quarter Scholarship	62	10	0	956	3				
	14th quarter Scholarship paid in September 1919	58	10	0	956	-				
7-11-1922	Return passage money	15	10	-	238	1	3			
25-11-1922	—do—	59	10	0	973	14	9	2468	9 10	
	Less Remitt							1372	-4-2	
								360	0 0	
								B.373	-4-2	

(14

192 .

From

B. N. VIJAYA, DEVA, M. A.
BARRISTER-AT-LAW.
PUBLIC PROSECUTOR & GOVT. PLEADER.
BANGALORE DVN.

To

The Legal Remembrancer
and Secretary to Government,
Law Department,
Bangalore

Dated 30-7-30

Despatched 30-7-30

Received

General No. 30/30-31
No.

Enclosures No. 427 pages

9r
21/7/30
Law 317

Sir

Sent herewith the files against
Mr. C. D. [illegible] matters.

I have the honour to send herewith the entire [illegible] papers in connection with the above case as desired by the Director of Industries and Commerce in his letter No. E_2-528/27-28 of the 29th instant. I request you to acknowledge the receipt of the same

Linked

I have the honour
Sir,
Your most obedient Servant

B. N. Deva
Public Prosecutor
Bangalore

Appendix F G—1

15

SUBJECT .....

.....

.....

Section Loans

Diary No. of letter replied to..... File No. 166-29

Serial No. 6

No.

General and Revenue Secretariat

( )

the *193*

To

The Director of I.t.c.

Date of issue 2.8.30

Sir,

Signed by .....

Subject :- Suit against Mr C.V. Ballappa & others

With reference to your letter No: E2-528/27.28 dated 29th July 1930 on the above subject, I have the honour to ~~Date~~ request ~~that~~ you to forward the documents returned to you with my letter No: P/457/Loan 166-29-4 dated 26th June 1930 so as to enable the draft plaint now sent to be

List of enclosures.....

Copied by.....

Examined by.....

over

Scrutinised.

I may however state that in view of the difficulties pointed out in para 3 of my letter referred to above, it is not clear how a decree can be prayed for against defendants 2 and 3. The Public Prosecutor may kindly be requested to explain the matter.

The draft plaint is herewith returned for retransmission with the above information.

I have etc.

Legal R^r.

MP
12/8

P 8854 / Law 166-29 Dy 2-8-30.

The Director or Industries and Commerce in Mysore,

Bangalore

Subject - Suit against Mr.C.V.Balappa & others.

With reference to your letter No.E2-528/27-28 dated 29th July 1930 on the above subject, I have the honour to request you to forward the documents returned to you with my letter No.P.7457/Law. 166-29-4 dated 26th June 1930 so as to enable the draft plaint now sent to be scrutinised.

I may however state that in view of the difficulties pointed out in para 3 of my letter referred to above, it is not clear how a decree can be prayed for against defendants 2 and 3. The Public Prosecutor may kindly be requested to explain the matter.

I have the honour to be,
Sir,
Your most obedient servant,

For Secy.to Govt.,Law Dept.,

Telegraphic Address: "INDUSCOM."

In reply please refer to
No. E2-528/27-28

GOVERNMENT OF MYSORE.
DEPARTMENT OF INDUSTRIES AND COMMERCE.

(1) 932 p 830

Law 166-29-7

OFFICE OF THE DIRECTOR,

Dated Bangalore, the 16th August 1930

19 AUG. 1930

FROM

C. RANGANATHA RAO SAHIB, ESQ., B.A., B.L.,
Director of Industries and Commerce in Mysore,
Bangalore (India).

To

P. Mahadevayya, Esq., B.A., B.L.,
Secretary to the Government of Mysore,
Law Departments, Bangalore.

SIR.

Subject:- Suit against Mr. C.V. Balappa & others.

With reference to your letter No.P.684/Law 166-29 of the 2nd instant on the above subject, I have the honour to state that the Public Prosecutor has this day been requested to forward the documents which were sent to him on the 28th June 1930 direct to you together with his explanation for preferring a decree against defendants 2 and 3.

I have the honour to be,
Sir,
Your most obedient servant,

C Ranganatha Rao Sahib

Director.

KS)

166-29

192

From
B. N. VIJAYA, DEVA, M.A.
BARRISTER-AT-LAW.
PUBLIC PROSECUTOR & GOVT. PLEADER
BANGALORE DVN.

To
The Legal Remembrancer
and Secretary to Government
Law Department

Dated 20-8-1930. Bangalore

Despatched —do—

Received

General No. 72/30-31
No.

Enclosure No. 9 pages of documents

P.W. 2118
0189
2118
Law 2118

Sir,

Suit against Mr. C.V. Ballappa

I have the honour to forward herewith documents containing 9 pages as desired by the Director of Industries and Commerce in Mysore, Bangalore in his letter no. E2-528/27-28 of the 18th instant. I request you to kindly acknowledge the receipt of the same.

I have the honour to be,
Sir,
your most obedient Servant

B. N. V. Deva

public prosecutor,
Bangalore.

SUBJECT....

Diary No. of letter replied to.....

Section Home
File No. 166-29
Serial No. 9

No. J 1114

General and Revenue Secretariat
( )
the 193

To

The PPr. Bangalore.

Date of issue 25/8/30

Signed by M'RS

Subject :— Suit against Mr. C.V. Balappa & others

Sir,

In acknowledging the receipt of the document containing 8 pages forwarded with your letter no 72/30-31 dated 20th August 1930, I am directed to state that the Proforma on which ~~for praying for~~ is prayed for a decree against defendants 2 & 3 in spite of the difficulties pointed out in

List of enclosures.....

Copied by.....

Examined by.....

office letter No P 7457 of
June 1930 addressed to the
rector of Industries and Commerce
ave not been furnished stated as yet,
nd to request that the same
may kindly be explained at an
early date.

I have etc

TSD
25/9 1115 Legal R^m & Sec^y Govt

Copy of the above is forwarded
to the Director of I&C for information
with reference to his letter no
E2-528/27-28 dated 19th Aug 1930.

20

F 1114 25th August 30.

The Public Prosecutor,

B a n g a l o r e.

Subject:- Suit against Mr. C.V. Balappa & others.

In acknowledging the receipt of the documents containing 8 pages forwarded with your letter No. 72/30-31 dated 20th August 1930, I am directed to state that the grounds on which a decree is prayed for against defendants 2 and 3 in spite of the difficulties pointed out in this office letter No.P. 7457 of 26th June 1930 addressed to the Director of Industries and Commerce have not been stated as yet and to request that the same may kindly be explained at an early date.

I have the honor to be,

Sir,

Your most obedient servant,

Sd/- P.Mahadevayya.

Secretary to Government
Law Department.

c.n.

Memo No.P. 1115 dy 25/8/30

Copy of the above is forwarded with compliments to the Director of Industries and Commerce for information with reference to his letter No. E.2-528/27-28 dated 19th August 1930.

By Order,

For Secretary to Government
Law Department.

21

GPB

192 .

From

B. N. VIJAYA, DEVA, M. A.,
BARRISTER-AT-LAW,
PUBLIC PROSECUTOR & GOVT. PLEADER,
BANGALORE DVN.

To

The Legal Remembrancer
and Secretary to Government
Law Department

Dated 25-8-30 Bangalore

Despatched -do-

Received

General No. 81/30-31
No.

Enclosure No.

Sir, Subject:. Suit against M. C. V. Ballappa + others

In continuation of this office No. 74/30-31 of the 20th instant I have the honour to state that 2nd and 3rd defendants were sought to be impleaded on the strength of the bond which they have executed. No-doubt, the bond is unregistered and it does not create a charge on any property.

I have the honour to be,
Sir,
your most obedient servant

B. N. Deva
public prosecutor,
Bangalore